arXiv:math/0607314v1 [math.CV] 13 Jul 2006

HÖLDER CONTINUOUS SOLUTIONS TO MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATIONS

V.GUEDJ & S.KOLODZIEJ & A.ZERIAHI

Abstract. We study the regularity of solutions to complex Monge-Ampère equations $(dd^c u)^n = f dV$, on bounded strongly pseudoconvex domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. We show, under a mild technical assumption, that the unique solution u to such an equation is Hölder continuous if the boundary values ϕ are Hölder continuous and the density f belongs to $L^p(\Omega)$ for some $p > 1$. This improves previous results by Bedford-Taylor and Kolodziej.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: *32W20, 32U15.*

Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded strongly pseudoconvex open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Given $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\partial\Omega)$ and $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, we consider the Dirichlet problem

$$MA(\Omega,\phi,f) : \begin{cases} u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}^0(\overline{\Omega}) \\ u = \phi \text{ on } \partial\Omega \\ (dd^c u)^n = f\beta_n \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Here $\beta_n = dV$ denotes the euclidean volume form in $\mathbb{C}^n$, $d = \partial + \overline{\partial}$, $d^c = i(\overline{\partial} - \partial)$, $PSH(\Omega)$ is the set of plurisubharmonic (psh for short) functions in Ω (the set of locally integrable functions u such that $dd^c u \geq 0$ in the sense of currents), and $(dd^c\,\cdot)^n$ denotes the complex Monge-Ampère operator: this operator is well defined on the subset of bounded (in particular continuous) psh functions, as follows from the work of E.Bedford and A.Taylor [BT 2]. We refer the reader to [K 4] for a recent survey on its properties.

The equation $MA(\Omega,\phi,f)$ has been studied intensively during the last decades. Let $\mathcal{B}(\Omega,\phi,f)$ denote the family of subsolutions to $MA(\Omega,\phi,f)$, i.e. the set of bounded functions v that are psh in Ω with $v \leq \phi$ on $\partial\Omega$ (i.e. $\limsup_{\zeta\to z} v(\zeta) \leq \phi(z)$ when $z \in \partial\Omega$) and $(dd^c v)^n \geq f\beta_n$ in Ω. It follows from the comparison principle [BT 2] that if a solution exists, it must coincide with the Perron-Bremermann envelope,

$$u(z) = u(\Omega,\phi,f)(z) := \sup\{v(z) \,/\, v \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega,\phi,f)\}.$$

It follows from the works of H.J.Bremermann [Br], J.Walsh [W] and E.Bedford-A.Taylor [BT 1] that $u(\Omega,\phi,f)$ is indeed a solution to $MA(\Omega,\phi,f)$ when $f \in \mathcal{C}^0(\overline{\Omega})$. S.Kolodziej has further shown in [K 2] that the solution $u(\Omega,\phi,f)$ is still continuous when $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, for some $p > 1$ (it is easy to check that $u(\Omega,\phi,f)$ is not necessarily locally bounded when the density is merely in $L^1(\Omega)$).

Higher regularity results have also been provided. E.Bedford and A.Taylor showed in [BT 1] that if $\phi \in Lip_{2\alpha}(\Omega)$ and $f^{1/n} \in Lip_\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$, then $u(\Omega,\phi,f) \in$

$Lip_\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$. The smoothness of the solution (assuming smoothness of ϕ and $f > 0$) is established in [CKNS]. Our aim here is to establish Hölder-continuity of $u(\Omega, \phi, f)$ in the spirit of [BT 1], only assuming the density f belongs to $L^p(\Omega)$, $p > 1$, as in [K 2]. Our main result is the following:

Theorem A. *Assume* $f \in L^p(\Omega)$*, for some* $p > 1$*, and* $\phi \in Lip_{2\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$*, with* $\nabla u(\Omega, \phi, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$*. Then*

$$u(\Omega, \phi, f) \in Lip_{\alpha'}(\overline{\Omega}), \quad \textit{for all } \alpha' < \min(\alpha, 2/[qn+2]),$$

where $1/p + 1/q = 1$*.*

The condition $\nabla u(\Omega, \phi, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$ is automatically satisfied if $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\partial\Omega)$: in this case $u(\Omega, \phi, 0) \in Lip_1(\overline{\Omega})$, hence $\nabla u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ is actually bounded in Ω (see [BT 1]). What really matters here is that there should exist a subsolution $v \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ such that $\nabla v \in L^2(\Omega)$. This implies (see Lemma 3.1), that $u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ and $u(\Omega, \phi, f)$ both have gradient in $L^2(\Omega)$.

We could not avoid the use of this extra (technical ?) hypothesis on the homogenous solution $u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$. Also the exponent α' is probably not optimal. We can get a better exponent by assuming that $\Delta u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ has finite mass in Ω (this is automatically satisfied when $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\partial\Omega)$).

Theorem B. *Assume* $f \in L^p(\Omega)$*, for some* $p > 1$*, and* $\phi \in Lip_{2\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$ *is such that that* $\Delta u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ *has finite mass in* Ω*. Then*

$$u(\Omega, \phi, f) \in Lip_{\alpha''}(\overline{\Omega}), \quad \textit{for all } \alpha'' < \min(\alpha, 2/[qn+1]),$$

where $1/p + 1/q = 1$*.*

The exponent α'' is not far from being optimal as Example 4.2 shows.

1. The stability estimate

Our main tool is the following estimate which is proved in [EGZ] in a compact setting (under growth – but no boundary – conditions, see Proposition 3.3 in [EGZ]). A similar – but weaker – estimate was established by S.Kolodziej in [K 3].

Theorem 1.1. *Fix* $0 \leq f \in L^p(\Omega)$*,* $p > 1$*. Let* φ, ψ *be two bounded psh functions in* Ω *such that* $(dd^c\varphi)^n = f\beta_n$ *in* Ω*, and* $\varphi \geq \psi$ *on* $\partial\Omega$*. Fix* $r \geq 1$ *and* $0 \leq \gamma < r/[nq+r]$*,* $1/p + 1/q = 1$*. Then*

$$\sup_\Omega(\psi - \varphi) \leq C||(\max(\psi - \varphi, 0)||_{L^r(\Omega)}^\gamma,$$

for some uniform constant $C = C(\gamma, ||f||_{L^p(\Omega)}, ||\psi||_{L^\infty}) > 0$*.*

The proof follows closely the one given in [EGZ], so we only recall the main ingredients, for the reader's convenience. The estimate is a simple consequence of the following result.

Proposition 1.2. *Fix* $f \in L^p(\Omega)$*,* $p > 1$*, and let* φ, ψ *be bounded psh functions in* Ω *such that* $\varphi \geq \psi$ *on* $\partial\Omega$*. If* $(dd^c\varphi)^n = f\beta_n$*, then for all* $\varepsilon > 0, \tau > 0$*,*

$$\sup_\Omega(\psi - \varphi) \leq \varepsilon + C\left[Cap(\varphi - \psi < -\varepsilon)\right]^\tau,$$

for some uniform constant $C = C(\tau, ||f||_{L^p(\Omega)})$*.*

Here Cap(·) denotes the Monge-Ampère capacity introduced and studied by E.Bedford and A.Taylor in [BT 2]. Recall that for $K \subset \Omega$,

$$\mathrm{Cap}(K) := \sup \left\{ \int_K (dd^c v)^n \,/\, v \in PSH(\Omega) \text{ with } -1 \leq v \leq 0 \right\}.$$

The proposition is a direct consequence of the following three lemmas:

Lemma 1.3. *Fix $\varphi, \psi \in PSH(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\overline{\lim}_{\zeta \to \partial\Omega}(\varphi - \psi) \leq 0$. Then for all $t, s > 0$,*

$$t^n \, Cap(\varphi - \psi < -s - t) \leq \int_{(\varphi - \psi < -s)} (dd^c \varphi)^n.$$

Lemma 1.4. *Assume $0 \leq f \in L^p(\Omega)$, $p > 1$. Then for all $\tau > 1$, there exists $C_\tau > 0$ such that for all $K \subset \Omega$,*

$$0 \leq \int_K f dV \leq C_\tau \left[Cap(K) \right]^\tau.$$

When $(dd^c\varphi)^n = fdV$, one can combine Lemma 1.3 and Lemma 1.4 to control $\mathrm{Cap}(\varphi - \psi < -s)$ by $\mathrm{Cap}(\varphi - \psi < -s - t)]^\tau$. This has strong consequences since $\tau > 1$, as the following result shows, when applied to $g(t) = \mathrm{Cap}(\varphi - \psi < -t - \varepsilon)^{1/n}$:

Lemma 1.5. *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a decreasing right-continuous function. Assume there exists $\tau, B > 1$ such that g satisfies*

$$H(\alpha, B) \qquad tg(s+t) \leq B[g(s)]^\tau, \ \forall s, t > 0.$$

Then there exists $S_\infty = S_\infty(\tau, B) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $g(s) = 0$ for all $s \geq S_\infty$.

One word about the proofs. Lemma 1.3 is a direct consequence of the "comparison principle" of E.Bedford and A.Taylor [BT 2] (see [K 4] p.32 for a detailed proof). Using Hölder's inequality, one reduces the proof of Lemma 1.4 to showing that the euclidean volume is bounded from above by the Monge-Ampère capacity. One can actually show that

$$Vol(K) \lesssim \exp[-Cap(K)^{-1/n}] \ \text{ (see Theorem 7.1 in [Z])},$$

which is a much better control than what we actually need. The last lemma is an elementary exercise, whose proof is given in [EGZ], Lemma 2.3.

2. Hölder continuous barriers

For fixed $\delta > 0$ we consider $\Omega_\delta := \{z \in \Omega \,/\, \mathrm{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) > \delta\}$ and set

$$u_\delta(z) := \sup_{||\zeta|| \leq \delta} u(z + \zeta), \; z \in \Omega_\delta.$$

This is a psh function in Ω_δ, when u is psh in Ω, which measures the modulus of continuity of u. We would like to use Theorem 1.1 applied with $\psi = u_\delta$. However u_δ is not globally defined in Ω, so we need to extend it with control on the boundary values. This is the contents of our next result which makes heavy use of the pseudoconvexity assumption.

Proposition 2.1. *Let* $u \in PSH(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ *be a psh function such that* $u_{|\partial\Omega} = \phi \in Lip_{2\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$. *Then there exists a family* $(\tilde{u}_\delta)_{0<\delta<\delta_0}$ *of bounded psh functions on* Ω *such that* $\tilde{u}_\delta \searrow u$ *in* Ω *as* $\delta \searrow 0$, *with*

$$\tilde{u}_\delta = \begin{cases} \max(u_\delta - C\delta^\alpha, u) \text{ in } \Omega_\delta \\ u \text{ in } \Omega \setminus \Omega_\delta \end{cases}$$

In particular $\sup_{\Omega_\delta} |\tilde{u}_\delta - u_\delta| \leq C\delta^\alpha$ *for* $0 < \delta < \delta_0$.

The proof relies on the construction of Hölder continuous plurisubharmonic and plurisuperhamonic barriers for the Dirichlet problem $MA(\Omega, \phi, f)$:

Lemma 2.2. *Fix* $\phi \in Lip_{2\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$, $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, $p > 1$, *and set* $u := u(\Omega, \phi, f)$. *Then there exists* $v, w \in PSH(\Omega) \cap Lip_\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$ *such that*

(1) $v(\zeta) = \phi(\zeta) = -w(\zeta), \forall \zeta \in \partial\Omega$,

(2) $v(z) \leq u(z) \leq -w(z), \forall z \in \Omega$.

Proof. Assume first that $\phi \equiv 0$. We are going to show that there exists a weak barrier $b_f \in PSH(\Omega) \cap Lip_1(\Omega)$ for the Dirichlet problem $MA(0, f, \Omega)$, i.e. a psh function which satisfies

- *(i)* $b_f(\zeta) = 0, \ \forall \zeta \in \partial\Omega$,

- *(ii)* $b_f \leq u(\Omega, 0, f)$, in Ω,

- *(iii)* $|b_f(z) - b_f(\zeta)| \leq C_1|z - \zeta|, \ \forall z \in \Omega, \ \forall \zeta \in \Omega$,

for some uniform constant $C_1 > 0$.

In order to construct b_f, we set $u_0 := u(\Omega, 0, f)$ and assume first that the density f is bounded near $\partial\Omega$: there exists a compact subset $K \subset \Omega$ such that $0 \leq f \leq M$ on $\Omega \setminus K$. Let ρ be a $\mathcal{C}^2$ strictly plurisubharmonic defining function for Ω. Then for $A > 0$ large enough the function $b_f := A\rho$ satisfies the condition $(dd^c b_f)^n \geq M\beta_n \geq f\beta_n$ on $\Omega \setminus K$. Moreover taking A large enough we also have $A\rho \leq m \leq u_0$ on a neighborhood of K, where $m := \min_\Omega u_0$. Therefore the function b_f is a $\mathcal{C}^2$ plurisubharmonic function on Ω satisfying the conditions $(dd^c b_f)^n \geq (dd^c u_0)^n$ on $\Omega \setminus K$ and $b_f \leq u_0$ on $\partial(\Omega \setminus K)$. This implies, by the comparison principle [BT 2], that $b_f \leq u_0$ in $\Omega \setminus K$, hence in Ω.

When f is not bounded near $\partial\Omega$, we can proceed as follows. Fix a large ball $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ so that $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Define $\tilde{f} := f$ in Ω and $\tilde{f} = 0$ in $\mathbb{B} \setminus \Omega$. We can use our previous construction to find a barrier function $b_{\tilde{f}} \in PSH(\mathbb{B}) \cap \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{B})$ for the Dirichlet problem $MA(\mathbb{B}, 0, \tilde{f})$ for the ball $\mathbb{B}$. Let $h = u(\Omega, -b_{\tilde{f}}, 0)$ denote the Bremermann function in Ω with boundary values $-b_{\tilde{f}}$, for the zero density. Since $-b_{\tilde{f}} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\partial\Omega)$, the psh function h is Lipschitz in Ω (see [BT 1]), therefore $b_f := h + b_{\tilde{f}} \in PSH(\Omega) \cap Lip_1(\Omega)$ is a barrier function for the Dirichlet problem $MA(\Omega, 0, f)$.

It remains to construct the functions v, w satisfying (1),(2) above. It follows from [BT 1] that the psh functions $u(\Omega, \pm\phi, 0)$ are Hölder continuous of order α. We let the reader check that the functions $v := u(\Omega, \phi, 0) + b_f$ and $w := u(\Omega, -\phi, 0) + b_f$ do the job. □

We are now ready for the proof of the proposition.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$|u(z) - u(\zeta)| \leq C|z-\zeta|^{\alpha}, \ \forall \zeta \in \partial\Omega, \forall z \in \Omega.$$

The functions $u_{\delta}(z) := \sup_{||\zeta|| \leq \delta} u(z+\zeta)$ are psh in Ω_{δ}. Observe that if $z \in \partial\Omega_{\delta}$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $||\zeta|| \leq \delta$ then $z+\zeta \in \partial\Omega$, hence $u_{\delta} - C\delta^{\alpha} \leq u(z)$. Thus the functions

$$\tilde{u}_{\delta}(z) := \begin{cases} \sup\{u_{\delta}(z) - C\delta^{\alpha}, u(z)\} \text{ in } \Omega_{\delta} \\ u \text{ in } \Omega \setminus \Omega_{\delta} \end{cases}$$

are psh and bounded in Ω and decrease to u as δ decreases to 0. □

Our construction of barriers allows us to control the total mass of the Laplacian of solutions to $MA(\Omega, \phi, f)$. This will be important in section 4.

Proposition 2.3. *Fix* $0 \leq f \in L^p(\Omega)$, $p > 1$, *and* $\phi \in Lip_{2\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$.

Then $\Delta u(\Omega, 0, f)$ *has finite mass in* Ω. *In particular, if* $\Delta u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ *has finite mass in* Ω, *then* $\Delta u(\Omega, \phi, f)$ *has finite mass in* Ω.

Note that $\Delta u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ has finite mass in Ω when $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\Omega)$, as explained in the proof below.

Proof. Assume first that $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\Omega)$. Consider any smooth extension of ϕ and correct it by adding $A\rho$, $A >> 1$, in order to obtain a smooth plurisubharmonic extension $\hat{\phi}$ which is defined in a neighborhood of $\overline{\Omega}$. Since $\hat{\phi}$ is a subsolution to $MA(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ whose Laplacian has finite mass in Ω, it follows from the comparison principle that $\Delta u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ also has finite mass in Ω.

Let $\tilde{f}$ be the trivial extension of f to a large ball $\mathbb{B}$ containing Ω. Let $b_{\tilde{f}} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{B})$ be a plurisubharmonic barrier for $MA(\mathbb{B}, 0, \tilde{f})$ (see the proof of Lemma 2.2). Then $b_f := u(\Omega, -b_{\tilde{f}}, 0) + b_{\tilde{f}}$ is a plurisubharmonic barrier for $MA(\Omega, 0, f)$. Its Laplacian has finite mass in Ω since $b_{\tilde{f}}$ is smooth, so it follows from the comparison principle that $\Delta u(\Omega, 0, f)$ has finite mass in Ω.

Set now $v := u(\Omega, 0, f) + u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$. This is a plurisubharmonic function in Ω such that $v = \phi$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $(dd^c v)^n \geq f dV$ in Ω. If $\Delta u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ has finite mass in Ω, then Δv has finite mass in Ω, hence $\Delta u(\Omega, \phi, f)$ also has finite mass in Ω. □

3. GRADIENT ESTIMATES

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem A. Let $u = u(\Omega, \phi, f)$ be the unique solution to the complex Monge-Ampère equation

$$(dd^c u)^n = f\beta_n \text{ in } \Omega,$$

with boundary values $u = \phi \in Lip_{2\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$. Since $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, $p > 1$, it follows from [K 2] that u is a continuous plurisubharmonic function. Our aim is to show that u is Hölder continuous.

Let $\tilde{u}_{\delta}$ be the functions given by Proposition 3.1. The stability estimate (Theorem 1.1) applied with $r = 2$ yields

$$\sup_{\Omega_{\delta}}(u_{\delta} - u) \leq C_1\delta^{\alpha} + \sup_{\Omega}(\tilde{u}_{\delta} - u) \leq C_1\delta^{\alpha} + C_2||u_{\delta} - u||^{\gamma}_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta})},$$

for $\gamma < 2/(nq+2)$, $1/p + 1/q = 1$. It remains to show that $||u_{\delta} - u||_{L^2(\Omega_{\delta})} \leq C_4\delta$ to conclude the proof.

It will be a consequence of Lemma 3.1 below that $\nabla u \in L^2(\Omega)$. Assuming this for the moment, we derive the desired upper-bound on $||u_\delta - u||_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)}$. Averaging the gradient of u on balls of radius δ yields, for all $||\zeta|| < \delta$,

$$\left(\int_{\Omega_\delta} |u(z+\zeta) - u(z)|^2 dV(z)\right)^{1/2} \leq \delta \, ||\nabla u||_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

By Choquet's lemma, there exists a sequence ζ_j, $||\zeta_j|| < \delta$, such that $u_\delta = (\sup_j u_j)^*$, in Ω_δ, where $u_j(z) := u(z+\zeta_j)$. Since $u_j - u \leq u_\delta - u$, it follows from Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem that

$$\left(\int_{\Omega_\delta} |u_\delta(z) - u(z)|^2 dV(z)\right)^{1/2} \leq \delta \, ||\nabla u||_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

This ends the proof of Theorem A up to the fact, to be established now, that u has gradient in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Since u is plurisubharmonic and continuous, $\nabla u \in L^2_{loc}(\Omega)$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 below that $\nabla u \in L^2(\Omega)$ as soon as u is bounded from below by a continuous psh function v such that $v \leq u$ in Ω, $v = u = \phi$ on $\partial\Omega$, and $\nabla v \in L^2(\Omega)$. Our extra assumption in Theorem A precisely yields such a function v. Indeed set $v := u(\Omega, \phi, 0) + b_f$, where b_f is the psh barrier constructed in the proof of Lemma 2.2: this is a psh function such that

- $v = \phi + 0 = u$ on $\partial\Omega$;
- $(dd^c v)^n \geq (dd^c b_f)^n \geq f\beta_n$ in Ω, thus $v \leq u$ in Ω;
- $\nabla u(\Omega, \phi, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\nabla b_f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, hence $\nabla v \in L^2(\Omega)$.

It is easy to check that $\nabla u(\Omega, \phi, 0) \in L^\infty(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ when $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\partial\Omega)$. We refer the reader to [BT 1] for a proof of the more delicate result that this still holds when $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\partial\Omega)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $u, v \in PSH(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $v \leq u$ on Ω and $v = u$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then $\int_\Omega du \wedge d^c u \wedge \omega^{n-1} \leq \int_\Omega dv \wedge d^c v \wedge \omega^{n-1}$.*

Proof. First assume that $u = v$ near the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Then we can approximate by smooth plurisubharmonic functions $u_\delta \downarrow u$ and $v_\delta \downarrow v$ with $u_\delta \leq v_\delta$ on Ω_δ and $u_\delta = v_\delta$ in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$, for $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ and ε small enough. Integrating by parts, we get

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} dv_\delta \wedge d^c v_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1} = \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} v_\delta d^c v_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1} - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} v_\delta dd^c v_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1}.$$

Since $v_\delta = u_\delta$ on a neighbourhood of $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$ we conclude that $v_\delta d^c v_\delta = u_\delta d^c u_\delta$ on this neighbourhood and then using again integration by parts we get

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} dv_\delta \wedge d^c v_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1} = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} du_\delta \wedge d^c u_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1} + \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} (u_\delta dd^c u_\delta - v_\delta dd^c v_\delta) \wedge \omega^{n-1}.$$

On the other hand, since $v_\delta = u_\delta$ on a neighbourhood of $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$ we conclude that $v_\delta \wedge d^c u_\delta = u_\delta \wedge d^c v_\delta$ on this neighbourhood and then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} u_\delta dd^c v_\delta - v_\delta dd^c u_\delta) \wedge \omega^{n-1} &= \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} (u_\delta d^c v_\delta - v_\delta d^c u_\delta) \wedge \omega^{n-1} \\ &- \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} (du_\delta \wedge d^c v_\delta - dv_\delta \wedge d^c u_\delta) \wedge \omega^{n-1} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} dv_\delta \wedge d^c v_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1} = \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} du_\delta \wedge d^c u_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1} + \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} (u_\delta - v_\delta)(dd^c u_\delta + dd^c v_\delta) \wedge \omega^{n-1}.$$

Since $v_\delta \leq u_\delta$ on Ω_δ, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} dv_\delta \wedge d^c v_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1} \geq \int_{\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} du_\delta \wedge d^c u_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1}.$$

We know by Bedford and Taylor's convergence theorem that $dv_\delta \wedge d^c v_\delta \wedge \omega^{n-1} \to dv \wedge d^c v \wedge \omega^{n-1}$. Taking the limit when $\delta \searrow 0$ we get

$$\int_{\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon} dv \wedge d^c v \wedge \omega^{n-1} \geq \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} du \wedge d^c u \wedge \omega^{n-1}.$$

Taking the limit when $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ we get the required inequality.

Now if we only know that $u = v$, we can define for $\varepsilon > 0$ $u_\varepsilon := \sup\{u - \varepsilon, v\}$. Then $v \leq u_\varepsilon$ on Ω and $u_\varepsilon = v$ near the boundary of Ω. Therefore we have for $\delta > 0$ small enough

$$\int_{\Omega} dv \wedge d^c v \wedge \omega^{n-1} \geq \int_{\Omega} du_\varepsilon \wedge d^c v_\varepsilon \wedge \omega^{n-1}.$$

Now by Bedford and Taylor's convergence theorem, we know that $du_\varepsilon \wedge d^c u_\varepsilon \wedge \omega^{n-1} \to du \wedge d^c u \wedge \omega^{n-1}$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Therefore we have

$$\int_{\Omega} dv \wedge d^c v \wedge \omega^{n-1} \geq \int_{\Omega} du \wedge d^c u \wedge \omega^{n-1},$$

which proves the required inequality. ☐

4. Laplacian estimates

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem B. We use the same method as above. The finiteness of the total mass of $\Delta u(\Omega, \phi, 0)$ allows a good control (see Lemma 4.2) on the terms $\hat{u}_\delta - u$, where

$$\hat{u}_\delta(z) := \frac{1}{\tau_n \delta^{2n}} \int_{|\zeta - z| \leq \delta} u(\zeta) dV(\zeta), z \in \Omega_\delta,$$

where τ_n denotes the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^n$. We shall compare $\hat{u}_\delta$ to u_δ in Lemma 4.1 below.

It follows from the construction of plurisubharmonic Hölder continuous barriers that the solution $u = u(\Omega, \phi, f)$ is Hölder continuous near the boundary, i.e. for $\delta > 0$ small enough, we have

$$u(z) - u(\zeta) \leq c_0 \delta^\alpha, \tag{1}$$

for $z, \zeta \in \overline{\Omega}$ with $\mathrm{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) \leq \delta, \mathrm{dist}(\zeta, \partial\Omega) \leq \delta$ and $|z - \zeta| \leq \delta$.

The link between u_δ and $\hat{u}_\delta$ is made by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Given $\alpha \in]0, 1[$, the following two conditions are equivalent.*

(*i*) *There exists $\delta_0, A > 0$ such that for any $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$,*

$$u_\delta - u \leq A\delta^\alpha \ \text{ on } \Omega_\delta.$$

(*ii*) *There exists $\delta_1, B > 0$ such that for any $0 < \delta < \delta_1$,*

$$\hat{u}_\delta - u \leq B\delta^\alpha \ \text{ on } \Omega_\delta.$$

Proof. Observe that $\hat{u}_\delta \leq u_\delta$ in Ω_δ, hence $(i) \Longrightarrow (ii)$ follows immediately.

We now prove that $(ii) \Longrightarrow (i)$. We need to show that there exists $A, \delta_0 > 0$ such that for $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$,

$$\omega(\delta) := \sup_{z \in \Omega_\delta} [u_\delta(z) - u(z)] \leq A\delta^\alpha.$$

Fix $\delta_\Omega > 0$ small enough so that $\Omega_\delta \neq \emptyset$ for $\delta \leq 3\delta_\Omega$. Since u is uniformly continuous, for any fixed $0 < \delta < \delta_\Omega$,

$$\nu(\delta) := \sup_{\delta < t \leq \delta_\Omega} \omega(t) t^{-\alpha} < +\infty.$$

We claim that there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ small enough so that for any $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$,

$$\omega(\delta) \leq A\delta^\alpha, \text{ with } A = (1 + 4^\alpha)c_0 + 2^\alpha 4^n B + \nu(\delta_\Omega),$$

where c_0 is the constant arising in inequality (1), while B is the constant from condition (ii). Assume this is not the case. Then there exists $0 < \delta < \delta_\Omega$ such that

$$\omega(\delta) > A\delta^\alpha. \tag{2}$$

Set $\delta := \sup\{t < \delta_\Omega \,/\, ø(t) > At^\alpha\}$. Then

$$\frac{ø(\delta)}{\delta^\alpha} \geq A \geq \frac{ø(t)}{t^\alpha} \text{ for all } t \in [\delta, \delta_\Omega]. \tag{3}$$

Since u is continuous, we can find $z_0 \in \overline{\Omega_\delta}$, $\zeta_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$ with $|z_0 - \zeta_0| \leq \delta$ s.t.

$$\omega(\delta) = \sup_{z \in \Omega_\delta} \left[\sup_{w \in B(z,\delta)} u(w) - u(z) \right] = u(\zeta_0) - u(z_0).$$

We first derive a contradiction if z_0 is close enough to the boundary of Ω. Assume that $\operatorname{dist}(z_0, \partial\Omega) \leq 3\delta$. Take $z_1 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(z_0, \partial\Omega) = \operatorname{dist}(z_0, z_1) \leq 4\delta$. It follows from (1) that

$$\omega(\delta) = u(\zeta_0) - u(z_0) = [u(\zeta_0) - u(z_1)] + [u(z_1) - u(z_0)] \leq [1 + 4^\alpha] c_0 \delta^\alpha.$$

This contradicts (3).

Thus we can assume that $\operatorname{dist}(z_0, \partial\Omega) > 3\delta$. Fix $b > 1$ so that $\operatorname{dist}(z_0, \partial\Omega) > (2b+1)\delta$. Thus any $z \in \mathbb{B}(\zeta_0, b\delta)$ satisfies $z \in \mathbb{B}(z_0, [b+1]\delta)$, hence $z \in \Omega_{b\delta}$. By using inequality (3) with $t = b\delta$, we get $u(\zeta_0) - u(z) \leq b^\alpha ø(\delta)$, hence

$$u(z) \geq u(\zeta_0) - b^\alpha ø(\delta), \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{B}(\zeta_0, b\delta). \tag{4}$$

Observe now that $\mathbb{B}(\zeta_0, \delta) \subset \mathbb{B}(z_0, [b+1]\delta)$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{u}_{(b+1)\delta}(z_0) &= \left(\frac{b}{b+1}\right)^{2n} \hat{u}_{b\delta}(\zeta_0) + \frac{1}{\tau_n (b+1)^{2n} \delta^{2n}} \int_{\mathbb{B}(z_0,(b+1)\delta) \setminus \mathbb{B}(\zeta_0, b\delta)} u dV \\
&\geq \left(\frac{b}{b+1}\right)^{2n} u(\zeta_0) + \left[(1 - \frac{b^{2n}}{(b+1)^{2n}}\right] [u(\zeta_0) - b^\alpha \omega(\delta)] \\
&= u(\zeta_0) - b^\alpha \left[1 - \frac{b^{2n}}{(b+1)^{2n}}\right] ø(\delta),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the subharmonicity of u together with inequality (4). Since $u(\zeta_0) = u(z_0) + ø(\delta)$, we infer, letting $b \to 1$,

$$\hat{u}_{2\delta}(z_0) \geq u(z_0) + 4^{-n} ø(\delta).$$

We now use assumption (ii), only considering small enough values of $\delta > 0$: since $\hat{u}_{2\delta}(z_0) \leq u(z_0) + B2^\alpha\delta^\alpha$, we get

$$\emptyset(\delta) \leq 4^n 2^\alpha B\delta^\alpha < A\delta^\alpha.$$

This contradicts the definition of δ, hence we have proved that $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$. $\square$

It is straightforward to check that if (i) is satisfied, then u belongs to $Lip_\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$. Thus Theorem B will be proved if we can establish (ii). It follows from Theorem 1.1 that is suffices to get control on the L^1-average of $\hat{u}_\delta - u$. This is the contents of our next result.

Lemma 4.2. *For $\delta > 0$ small enough, we have*

$$\int_{\Omega_\delta} [\hat{u}_\delta(z) - u(z)] dV_{2n}(z) \leq c_n \|\Delta u\| \delta^2,$$

where $c_n > 0$ is a uniform constant.

Proof. It follows from Jensen's formula that for $z \in \Omega_\delta$ and $0 < r < \delta$,

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{2n-1}} \int_{|\xi|=1} u(z + r\xi) dS_{2n-1} = u(z) + \int_0^r t^{1-2n} (\int_{|\zeta|\leq t} dd^c u \wedge \beta_{n-1}) dt.$$

Using polar coordinates we get, for $z \in \Omega_\delta$,

$$\hat{u}_\delta(z) - u(z) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{2n-1}\delta^{2n}} \int_0^\delta r^{2n-1} dr \int_0^r t^{1-2n} (\int_{|\zeta - z|\leq t} dd^c u \wedge \beta_{n-1}) dt.$$

Finally Fubini's theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_\delta} (\hat{u}_\delta - u) dV_{2n} &\leq a_n \delta^{-2n} \int_0^\delta r^{2n-1} dr \int_0^r t^{1-2n} (\int_{|\zeta|\leq t} (\int_\Omega \Delta u) dt \\ &\leq c_n \delta^2 \|\Delta u\|. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

This ends the proof of Theorem B since by proposition 2.3, $\Delta u = \Delta u(\Omega, \phi, f)$ has finite mass in Ω.

We now give a simple example which shows that one can not expect a better exponent than $\alpha = 2/nq$, for $1/p + 1/q = 1$.

Example 4.3. *Consider $u(z_1, \ldots, z_n) := |z_1|^\alpha \cdot ||(z_2, \ldots, z_n)||^2$. This is a plurisubharmonic function in $\mathbb{C}^n$ which is Hölder-continuous of exponent $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. We let the reader check that*

$$(dd^c u)^n = f dV, \quad \text{with } f(z) = \frac{1}{|z_1|^{2-n\alpha}} g(z_2, \ldots z_n),$$

where $g > 0$ is a smooth density.

Given $p > 1$, f belongs to $L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ whenever $\alpha = \varepsilon + 2/nq$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$. This shows that we cannot get a better exponent than $2/nq$ in Theorems A,B.

References

BT 1 E.BEDFORD & B.A.TAYLOR: The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge-Ampère equation. Invent. Math. **37** (1976), no. 1, 1–44.

BT 2 E.BEDFORD & B.A.TAYLOR: A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions. Acta Math. **149** (1982), no. 1-2, 1–40.

Br H.J.BREMERMANN: On a generalized Dirichlet problem for plurisubharmonic functions and pseudo-convex domains. Characterization of Šilov boundaries. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **91** (1959) 246–276.

CKNS L.CAFFARELLI & J.J.KOHN & L.NIRENBERG & J.SPRUCK: The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations. II. Complex Monge-Ampère, and uniformly elliptic, equations. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **38** (1985), no. 2, 209–252.

EGZ P.EYSSIDIEUX & V.GUEDJ & A.ZERIAHI: Singular Kähler-Einstein metrics. Preprint arXiv math.AG/0603431.

GZ V.GUEDJ & A.ZERIAHI: Intrinsic capacities on compact Kähler manifolds. J. Geom. Anal. **15** (2005), no. 4, 607-639.

K 1 S.KOLODZIEJ: Some sufficient conditions for solvability of the Dirichlet problem for the complex Monge-Ampère operator. Ann. Polon. Math. **65** (1996), no. 1, 11–21.

K 2 S.KOLODZIEJ: The complex Monge-Ampère equation. Acta Math. **180** (1998), no. 1, 69–117.

K 3 S.KOLODZIEJ: Equicontinuity of families of plurisubharmonic functions with bounds on their Monge-Ampère masses. Math. Z. **240** (2002), no. 4, 835–847.

K 4 S.KOLODZIEJ: The complex Monge-Ampère equation and pluripotential theory. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **178** (2005), no. 840, x+64 pp.

W J.WALSH: Continuity of envelopes of plurisubharmonic functions. J. Math. Mech. **18** 1968/1969 143–148.

Z A.ZERIAHI: Volume and capacity of sublevel sets of a Lelong class of plurisubharmonic functions. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **50** (2001), no. 1, 671–703.

Slawomir Kolodziej
Jagiellonian University
Institute of Mathematics
Reymonta 4, 30-059 KRAKOW (POLAND)
Slawomir.Kolodziej@im.uj.edu.pl

Vincent Guedj & Ahmed Zeriahi
Laboratoire Emile Picard
UMR 5580, Université Paul Sabatier
118 route de Narbonne
31062 TOULOUSE Cedex 04 (FRANCE)
guedj@picard.ups-tlse.fr ; zeriahi@picard.ups-tlse.fr